



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

10/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,436	04/02/2001	Richard C. Gowen	051207-1080	1807
22827	7590	04/07/2006	EXAMINER	
DORITY & MANNING, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1449 GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449			CORRIELUS, JEAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/825,436	GOWEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jean M. Corrielus	2162

All Participants:

(1) Jean M. Corrielus. (3) _____.

(2) Richard Moose (Reg. No. 31,226). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 March 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims discussed:

1-20

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In the last office action the examiner had mistakenly rejected claims 1-20 under a non-statutory provisional double patenting. The double patenting rejection will be withdrawn. The last office action, mailed on November 3, 2006, will be vacated and subsequent office action will be forth coming. The office is sorry for the inconvenient.



JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER